



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,832	02/05/2004	Joseph E. Phillips	CM05200H	6002
22917	7590	04/24/2006	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA, INC. 1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD IL01/3RD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			CHANG, RICHARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/772,832

Applicant(s)

PHILLIPS ET AL.

Examiner

Richard Chang

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-12 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments and amendments, filed on 1/31/2006, with respect to claims 1-2 and 4-12 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim 3 had been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent No. 5,570,366 ("Baker et al.") in view of US patent No. 6,847,620 B1 ("Meier").

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Baker et al. teach a system and method for handling multicast/broadcast by the access points over IP (See Fig. 4) comprising of

at an Access Point (AP) (See Fig. 2, with AP module, table management module, both wired and wireless ports),

determining (checking the table) whether there is at least one wireless subscriber unit (mobile terminal) belonging to the particular multicast group and associated with the access point, and

rebroadcasting the multicast packet over a wired segment (high speed wired LAN) (See Fig. 4),

rebroadcasting the multicast packet over a wireless segment (wireless LAN) only if there is at least one wireless subscriber unit (mobile terminal) belonging to the particular multicast group and associated with the access point (filtering enabled) (See Fig. 8, Col. 4, line 62 – Col. 5, line 35).

Baker et al. teaches substantially all the claimed invention but did not disclose expressly the particular application involving limitations of “a IGMP JOIN message including multicast packet intended for a particular multicast group”.

Meier teaches a similar mobile VLAN using an IGMP JOIN message including multicast packet for a particular multicast group (See Col. 5, lines 33-45).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Meier in Baker et al. in order to obtain a system and method for handling multicast/broadcast by the access points over IP and to take advantage of using a IGMP JOIN message including multicast packet intended for a particular multicast group in claims 1 and 8.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to use a IGMP JOIN message including multicast packet intended for a particular multicast group, as suggested by Meier in Col. 5, lines 33-45. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the

Art Unit: 2616

invention pertains to combine Meier with Baker et al. to obtain the inventions specified in claims 1 and 8.

Regarding claim 2, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 1 and Baker et al. further teach that updating the storage medium by detecting Internet Group Management Protocol (IGMP) messages from wireless subscriber units (See Fig. 8, Col. 4, line 62 – Col. 5, line 35), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 4, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 1 and Baker et al. further teach that Baker et al. further teach that consulting a storage medium (table management module), wherein the storage medium comprises a list (table) of wireless subscriber units (mobile terminal) along with their membership to at least one multicast group and whether the subscriber unit is currently associated with the access point (defined by parameters) and updating the storage medium (table) by detecting Internet Group Management Protocol messages (IP message frame) from wireless subscriber units (mobile terminal) (See Fig. 8, Col. 4, line 62 – Col. 5, line 35), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 5, as discussed above, Baker et al. teaches substantially all the claimed invention but did not disclose expressly the particular application involving limitations of “step of updating the storage medium (table) by receiving Inter-Access Point Protocol messages”.

Meier further teaches a similar mobile VLAN using Inter-Access Point Protocol messages (See Col. 11, line 44 to Col. 11, line 3).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Meier in Baker et al. in order to obtain a system and method for handling multicast/broadcast by the access points over IP and to take advantage of using Inter-Access Point Protocol messages in claims 1 and 8.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to using Inter-Access Point Protocol messages, as suggested by Meier in Col. 11, line 44 to Col. 11, line 3. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Meier with Baker et al. to obtain the inventions specified in claims 1 and 8.

Regarding claim 6, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 1 and Baker et al. further teach step of updating the storage medium (table) by removing an entry from the storage medium (table) based on inactivity from a wireless subscriber unit (mobile terminal) after a predetermined period of time lapses (See Col. 6, lines 55–58), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 7, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 1 and Baker et al. further teach that rebroadcasting occurs if there is at least one wireless subscriber unit belonging to the particular multicast group (VLAN) and associated with the access point (AP) that did not originate the multicast packet

Art Unit: 2616

(See Fig. 8, Col. 4, line 62 – Col. 5, line 35), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 9-10, as discussed above, these claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 1 and 8 and Baker et al. further teach that a field or a bit (ID field) in the multicast packet signals the automatic rebroadcast of the multicast packet (as IGMP application) (See Fig. 6, Col. 3, line 57 – Col. 4, line 24), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

Regarding claim 11, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 8 and Baker et al. further teach that the multicast packet is originated from a wireless subscriber unit (A) (See Fig. 4, Col. 3, lines 24– 34), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

Regarding claim 12, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 8 and Baker et al. further teach that at a subscriber unit (See Fig 4, mobile terminal A) generating a multicast packet intended for a particular multicast group, setting a first value (ID field) within the multicast packet if the subscriber unit (mobile terminal) desires a rebroadcast of the multicast packet (filtering enabled), otherwise setting a second value (filtering disabled) within the multicast packet, and transmitting the multicast packet (See Fig. 6, Col. 3, line 57 – Col. 4, line 24), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3129. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RKC

rkc

Richard Chang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2616

Ricky Q. Ngo
RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER